

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 have been examined. New claims 21-30 have been added to further describe the patentable features of the present invention. Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims 8, 9, 17, 18, and 20 in a divisional or continuation application.

In addition, independent claims 1-3 have been amended to incorporate the features of claims 8 and 9, and independent claims 10-12 have been amended to incorporate the features of claims 17 and 18.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al. (hereinafter Dutta)(U.S. 6,918,066). Applicants traverse the rejections based on the following comments.

A. Claims 1-3 and 10-12

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A browser testing system comprises a browser test server connected via one or more wired or wireless communication networks to a device equipped with a browser operable to access the Internet,

wherein one or more test cases to test the browser are registered with the browser test server,

wherein the browser test server provides a tester with a session generated from one or more predetermined test cases according to a selection of the one of more test cases registered with the browser test server by the tester accessing the browser test server through the communication networks, and

wherein the browser test server stores one or more values obtained from browser testing by use of the session,

wherein each of the test cases is a contents file including one or more tags or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined contents that will be tested as to whether the contents are normally provided through the browser, and

the session includes the one or more predetermined test cases selected by the tester which constitute a single web page and the session is the web page for the browser testing, the web page having a predetermined URL address that indicates a location where the web page is registered on the browser test server.

Dutta relates to a method to develop and test WML/HTML applications (i.e., web sites) on a multitude of user agents/browsers at the same time (Abstract). In particular, a user selects a multiple browsers and executes a web site file on the multiple browsers by simultaneously viewing the web site in the form or screen shots, each screen shot corresponding to a particular browser (Abstract and col. 4, lines 19-65). During testing of the web page, an emulator program eliminates tags included in the source code of the web page which are not supported a particular browser (i.e., browser type) and shows the output thereof (col. 4, lines 35-37). Thus, the appearance of the web site may differ for other browsers having different browser types. Finally, a scorecard is created which compares the web site to criteria, such as percentage of the content of the web site displayed by each browser, etc. (col. 7, lines 36-59). Thereafter, the user may decide to modify the source code of the web site based on the screen shots displayed and the scorecard information.

The Examiner appears to interpret the claimed test case to be a web page (e.g., a WML/HTML file) which inherently includes one or more script symbols, the claimed predetermined test case to be a selected web page for testing, and the claimed session to be the act or period of time devoted to opening web (i.e., the selected web page) and testing the web

page in the multiple browsers. Furthermore, the Examiner appears to interpret the one or more values obtained from browser testing by use of the session to be the values related to the web site provided by a scorecard.

However, according to claim 1, each of the test cases is a contents file and a session includes one or more predetermined tests cases selected by the tester which constitute a single web page. In other words, the session is a web page and each of the predetermined test cases (i.e., test cases) is a contents file that, together, constitute the web page. Therefore, the Examiner misinterprets the claimed features corresponding to a test case, a predetermined test case and a session. In particular, a test case is not a web page and a session is not the act of opening web pages for testing, according to claim 1. In view of the above, Dutta fails to disclose that “the browser test server provides a tester with a session generated from one or more predetermined test cases...wherein each of the test cases is a contents file including one or more tags or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined contents that will be tested as to whether the contents are normally provided through the browser, and the session includes the one or more predetermined tests cases selected by the tester which constitute a single web page and the session is the web page for the browser testing, the web page having a predetermined URL address that indicates a location where the web page is registered on the browser test server.”

Claim 2, 3 and 10-12 include analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features recited in claim 1, and therefore, claim 2, 3 and 10-12 should be patentable for the reasons discussed for claim 1.

B. Claim 4, 14 and 15

Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, “a first platform for developing a test case, into which the test case for testing the browser is entered and registered with a database.” Dutta merely discloses testing a WML/HTML application (i.e., a web site) as a whole, and does not provide a test case for testing the browser in view of claim 1. That is, Dutta does not provide a contents file used for testing, which is used to generate the session (i.e., the web page). Therefore, claim 4 should be patentable for at least this reason.

Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “creating one or more contents files for use in testing the browser as to whether the test cases are normally provided through the selected browser and its version, and registering the created contents files in the database by category.” Again, Dutta fails to disclose that content files are used in testing for determining (testing) whether the test cases are normally provided through the selected browser and its version. Therefore, claim 14 should be patentable for at least this reason.

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, “selecting the one or more test cases to be tested among the test cases registered in the selected browser and its version and creating a session with the selected test cases.” However, Dutta does not disclose testing the test cases as claimed. Therefore, claim 15 should be patentable for at least this reason.

C. Claims 6, 7 and 13

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, “reporting the result of the browser testing includes representing the values for the test cases as at least one of tables and graphs and outputting the

represented values as a document.” (emphasis added). Dutta, at best discloses representing values for the web page as a whole such that the user can judge whether to modify the source code. Dutta, however, does not disclose that the values are for the test cases (i.e., the contents files) in view of claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 should be patentable for at least this reason.

In addition, claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, “reporting the result of the browser testing includes creating a new session by extracting, deleting or adding only those test cases having a particular value from or to the predetermined test cases and retesting the browser by using the newly created session.” (emphasis added). For similar reasons presented above in conjunction with claim 6, Dutta does not disclose providing test cases with a particular value as a result of the testing. Therefore, claim 7 should be patentable for at least this reason.

In addition, claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, “a test result reporting step of editing the test cases, which constitute the session and have the result values, and reporting the result values of the browser testing.” (emphasis added). For similar reasons presented above in conjunction with claims 6 and 7, Dutta does not disclose test cases having the result values. Therefore, claim 13 should be patentable for at least this reason.

D. Remaining claims

Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta. However, claim 19 should be patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1.

New claims

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 21-30 to further define the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit claims 21-30 recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,


Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512